

**CHANGE IN SHIJING EXEGESIS:
SOME NOTES ON THE REDISCOVERY OF THE
MUSICAL ASPECT OF THE “ODES” IN THE SONG
PERIOD**

BY

ACHIM MITTAG

University of Munich

Introduction

To this day it is a commonly held view that the exegetical tradition of the “Book of Odes” (*Shijing* 詩經) as established by the Mao 毛 and Zheng 鄭 exegesis in the Han period was consistent throughout premodern China: “The Mao Commentary in the edition of Cheng Hsüan . . . is the repository of exegesis that interpreted individual *Shih-ching* poems as critical comments on specific political situations of the early Chou period. These are the infamous ‘allegorical’ readings of the *Shih-ching*, which have come under attack since the May Fourth Movement in 1919. Whatever their relation to Western allegory and whatever feelings the modern reader may have toward them, the Mao readings were the accepted interpretations of the *Shih-ching* for over two thousand years.”¹

Contrary to this view, however, traditional as well as modern accounts have pointed out that the Song period marked a major turning point in the history of classical studies in premodern China, even comparable to the revolution of Bible exegesis during the Christian Reformation.² One aspect of this fundamental change concerns *Shijing* scholarship in the Song dynasty. More than any other scholar who questioned the traditional exegesis, Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) has been credited with having overthrown the early

¹ Charles Hartman, in *The Indiana Companion to Traditional Chinese Literature*, ed. by W.H. Nienhauser, Jr., Bloomington, 1986, p. 60.

² See Steven Van Zoeren, *Poetry and Personality. Reading, Exegesis, and Hermeneutics in Traditional China*, Stanford, 1991, p. 151.

interpretations by Mao and Zheng, thereby establishing a “second milestone” (Shih-Hsiang Chen) in traditional *Shijing* exegesis. His most innovative view concerned the so-called “depraved songs” (*yinben zhi shi* 淫奔之詩), which he maintained were written by “lascivious persons” (*yinbenzhe* 淫奔者) and lacking any moralistic intention.³ Zhu Xi has therefore been rightly considered to be the “pioneer in freeing the *Classic of Songs* from traditional moralistic exegesis”.⁴ Modern *Shijing* research is closely connected with the re-evaluation of Zhu Xi’s “Composite Commentary on the Odes” (*Shi jizhuan* 詩集傳), which had been held in low esteem for three centuries by Qing scholars. The way for such a re-evaluation was paved by no less a scholar than Fu Sinian 傅斯年 (1896–1950) in an article published just on the eve of May Fourth.⁵

³ Zhu Xi’s theory of the “depraved songs” is fully developed in his two discourses contained in *Shi xu bian* 詩序辨說 (cited according to *Qinding Shijing zhuan* 欽定詩經傳說彙纂 [wooden block print, Huzhou: Zhongwen shuju, 1871] A/29a–31b) and, under the title of *Du Lüshi Shi ji Sang zhong pian* 讀呂氏詩記桑中篇, in (*Hui’an xiansheng*) *Zhu Wengong wenji* (晦庵先生) 朱文公文集 (ed. *Sibu congkan* 四部叢刊 [hereafter SBCK] A/58–59) 70/1a–3a. See also the two letters to Wu Bida 吳必大 and Wang Defu 汪得輔, in *Zhu Wengong wenji* 52/13a–b and 52/38b (*Da Wu Bofeng* #10 and *Da Wang Chengru biezhì* #4). According to Chen Lai 陳來, *Zhu zi shuxin biannian kaozheng* 朱子書信編年考證, Shanghai: Shanghai renmin, 1989, p. 326 and p. 308/309, these two letters were written in 1191 and after 1192 respectively. The theory of the “depraved songs” is summed up in Zhu Xi’s own words in his explanation of the maxim “There is no improper thinking” (*si wu xie* 思無邪; *Lunyu* 論語 11.2) in his *Lunyu* commentary and in the “Outline” of his *Shijing* commentary (*Shi zhuan gangling* 詩傳綱領; transmitted in the palace edition of the *Shi jizhuan* from 1447 [Bay. Staatsbibliothek L.sin. I 85]). It reads: “Regarding the texts of the Odes, it may be stated that the morally sound can move the virtuous mind of human beings, while the morally unsound may be taken as admonitions of their disposition for indolence and excess. The function (of the Odes) may be summarized in the only purpose to bring man about to attain the correct measure of his feelings” (*Sishu zhangju jizhu* 四書章句集注 [ed. Peking: Zhonghua, 1983], p. 53). In addition, there are various “recorded conversations” (*yulu* 語錄) in which Zhu Xi deals in a similar way with the “depraved songs” (see, for instance, the “recorded conversation” cited in n. 97 below). For an analysis of Zhu Xi’s interpretations of about thirty Odes from *Wei* 衛 and *Zheng* 鄭 as “depraved songs”, see Cheng Yuanmin 程元敏, “Zhu zi suo ding *Guofeng* zhong yanqingxushi yanshu” 朱子所定國風中言情緒詩研索, *Kong Meng xuebao* 孔孟學報 no. 26 (1973), pp. 153–164, and Cai Genxiang 蔡根祥, “Zhu Xi *Shi jizhuan Zhengfeng yinshi shuo pingyi*” 朱熹詩集傳鄭風淫詩說平議, *Kong Meng yuekan* 孔孟月刊 25:1 (1986), pp. 21–25.

⁴ Hans H. Frankel, *The Flowering Plum and the Palace Lady. Interpretations of Chinese Poetry*, New Haven & London, 1976, p. 53.

⁵ See Fu Sinian 傅斯年, “Song Zhu Xi de *Shijing jizhuan* he *Shi xu bian*” 宋朱熹的詩經集傳和詩序辨, in *Fu Sinian xuanji* 傅斯年選集, 10 vols., Taipei: Wenxing, 1967, vol. 2, pp. 283–295.

Here I want to consider the process which Zhu Xi underwent during his life-long study of the *Shijing*, which started with his early use of traditional exegesis and eventually led to a new understanding of the “Odes”. This process is one of the most exciting chapters in the history of classical learning. However, we in fact know very little about this particular chapter. Consequently, all modern accounts of Zhu Xi’s *Shijing* studies fall short of an adequate analysis regarding the genesis and early reception of his *Shijing* commentary—a typical example of how modern sinological research is seriously restricted and misled by the textual research of Qing scholars. Having discussed this question at length in an earlier paper,⁶ I will limit myself to a brief outline of the external aspects of Zhu Xi’s *Shijing* studies, drawing attention to a version of his *Shi jizhuan* not taken into account so far. Then, I shall discuss Zhu Xi’s new exegesis in the context of the rediscovery of the musical aspect of the “Odes” in the *Shijing* scholarship of the Song period.

The genesis of Zhu Xi’s Shijing studies reconsidered

The general view of the genesis of Zhu Xi’s *Shijing* studies which remains dominant to this day is largely based on three accounts from the Qing dynasty.⁷ According to this view, Zhu Xi’s exegetical work on the *Shijing* must be divided into two phases. In the first phase Zhu Xi predominantly made use of the traditional commentaries. This is evident in the many glosses cited under his name in the “Notes on the *Odes* in the Private Studio of Mr Lü” (*Lüshi jiashu du Shi ji* 呂氏家塾讀詩記; hereafter *Du Shi ji*) by Lü Zuqian 呂祖謙 (1137–1181). In his “Epilogue” to the *Du Shi ji*, dated ninth month, 1182, Zhu Xi himself accounts for this fact by regretting that Lü Zuqian had only made use of the “meagre sayings of my youth”, by which he was not convinced any more.⁸ Thus, in the late version

⁶ “Notes on the Genesis and Early Reception of Chu Hsi’s *Shi chih-chuan* – Some Facets for Re-evaluation of Sung Classical Learning”, in *Papers on Society and Culture of Early Modern China*, ed. by Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei, 1992 (*Symposium Series of the Institute of History and Philology* no. 1), pp. 721–780.

⁷ See *Qinding Shijing zhuanshuo huizuan*, *Shi xu bianshuo* A/22a, A/73b, and B/62b (concerning Ode no. 26, *Bo zhou*, no. 91, *Zi jin*, and no. 279, *Feng nian*); *Zhu zi nianpu* 朱子年譜 (ed. *Zhongguo xueshu mingzhu* 中國學術名著 [hereafter *ZGXSMZ*], vol. 82) 2A/67–69 and *kaoyi* 考異 2/279–280; *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 四庫全書總目提要 (ed. 2 vols., Peking: Zhonghua, 1965, 1981; hereafter *SK*) 15/122c–123b.

⁸ See *Zhu Wengong wenji* 76/7a, h.9ff. In the used edition of the *Du Shi ji* 讀詩記

handed down to us as the *textus receptus*, he took a different approach and produced completely new interpretations of some of the Odes, above all those songs in the *Wei* and *Zheng* sections which he considered “depraved songs”.

Despite some differences in the three cited Qing accounts, they basically all agree that Zhu Xi's *Shijing* commentary was written in two phases and published in two versions. This hitherto unquestioned two-phase scheme was replaced with a three-phase scheme by Qian Mu 錢穆 in his comprehensive monograph on Zhu's intellectual life.⁹ According to this scheme, the first phase consists of the glosses in the *Du Shi ji*, the second contains Zhu Xi's attack on the “Prefaces” in his “Discussions on the *Prefaces* to the Odes” (*Shi xu bianshuo* 詩序辨說), while the third phase presents the commonly used edition of the *Shi jizhuan*. Qian Mu not only contradicts the authors of the *SK* who had considered the *Shi xu bianshuo* to be Zhu Xi's last attempt to reinterpret the “Odes”; he also treats the question of the motivation for the changes in Zhu Xi's approach to the “Odes” with much more care, emphasizing the influence of Lü Zuqian and Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072).

In recent articles on Zhu Xi's *Shijing* studies, scholars have followed either the traditional two-phase scheme¹⁰ or the three-phase scheme suggested by Qian Mu.¹¹ Trying to settle the case, I

(*Congshu jicheng* 叢書集成 [hereafter *CSJC*] 1716–23) this “Epilogue” (*houxu* 後序) has been moved to the beginning.

⁹ See Qian Mu, *Zhuzi xin xue'an* 朱子新學案, 5 vols., Taipei: Sanmin, 1971, 1982, vol. 4, pp. 53–80.

¹⁰ See e.g. Li Jiashu 李家樹 (Lee Kar-shui), “*Shijing Guofeng Mao Xu Zhu Zhuan yitong kao*” 詩經國風毛序朱傳異同考, *Journal of Oriental Studies* 17 (1979), pp. 118–133; Pan Zhonggui 潘重規, “Zhu Xi shuo *Shi qianhouqi zhi zhuanbian*” 朱子說詩前後期之轉變, *Kong Meng yuekan* 22:12 (1982), pp. 17–19, 30; Zhao Peilin 趙沛霖 (ed.), *Shijing yanjiu fansi* 詩經研究反思, Tianjin: Tianjin jiaoyu, 1989, pp. 352–360; Wong Siu-kit and Lee Kar-shui, “Poems of Depravity: A Twelfth Century Dispute on the Moral Character of the *Book of Songs*”, *T'oung Pao* 75 (1989), pp. 209–225.

¹¹ See e.g. Zuo Songchao 左松超, “Zhu Xi lun *Shi zhuzhang ji qi suo zhu Shi jizhuan*” 朱熹論《詩》主張及其所著《詩集傳》, *Kong Meng xuebao* no. 55 (1988), pp. 73–88. See also Ruan Tingzhao 阮廷焯, “Chaoxian jiu chaoben *Shi jizhuan kaosu*” 朝鮮舊抄本《詩集傳》考索, *Dalu zazhi* 大陸雜誌 82:3 (1991), pp. 18–31, where another article by Zuo Songchao is cited (pp. 18–19). Unlike Qian Mu, Zuo identifies the second phase with the edition of the *Shi jizhuan* in 20 j. and the third phase with the edition in 8 j. This is, of course, not correct because the so-called “common edition” (*suben* 俗本) in 8 j. did not appear until the Ming dynasty, see Lü Yi 呂藝, “Qing ji jindai chuanshi *Shi jizhuan* Song kanben gailun” 清及近代傳世《詩集傳》宋刊本概論, *Wenxian* 文獻 no. 22 (1984), pp. 38–52, here p.

set out for a new attempt to reconstruct the genesis of Zhu's *Shijing* commentary. In Zhu's correspondence, notably with Lü Zuqian, I found new references that had not been taken into account so far.¹² Furthermore, it appeared that some references bearing crucial information had been wrongly dated by Wang Maohong 王懋竑 (1668–1741) in Zhu Xi's standard *nianpu* 年譜 biography.¹³ Pieced together, the data obtained produced a completely new view in which it became apparent that not two but three independent versions of Zhu Xi's *Shijing* commentary had existed. These three versions, which I call the early, middle, and late versions, clearly reflect three different stages in the development of Zhu Xi's *Shijing* studies.¹⁴

Any further research would be fruitless if no other information on the hitherto unknown middle version existed. Fortunately this is not the case. In fact, we know far more about the middle version than we do about the early version as cited in the *Du Shi ji*. Besides occasional references by late Song commentators,¹⁵ it is cited at length in two large collective commentaries, namely the "Composite Explanations on the *Mao Shi*" (*[Conggui] Mao Shi jijie* [叢桂毛詩集解] by Duan Changwu 段昌武, and the "Compilation Concerning the *Odes*" (*Shi ji* 詩緝) by Yan Can 嚴粲, both bearing a foreword dated 1248. The fact that these two works used the middle version becomes evident when comparing the glosses and annotations which are cited in them under Zhu Xi's name with those quoted in the *Du Shi ji* (= the early version) and with the *textus receptus* (= the late version). A first survey of the differences between the three versions showed that the middle version contained several

38. To my knowledge, the first edition of the *Shi jizhuan* in 8 j. was as late as from the Zhengtong period (1436–1449), being a part of the widely circulating palace edition of the commentaries on the Five Classics and the Four Books by Song and Yuan scholars (*[Song Yuan ren zhu] Wujing Sishu* [宋元人註] 五經四書), see (*Guoli zhongyang tushuguan*) *Shanben shumu. Zengding ben* (國立中央圖書館) 善本書目·增訂本, 4 vols., Taipei, 1967, I, p. 101–102.

¹² The most important pieces of reference were found in the two letters to Lü Zuqian and Wu Bida, see *Da Lü Bogong* #78 and *Da Wu Bofeng* #3, in *Zhu Wengong wenji* 34/19a–b and 52/2b–7b.

¹³ My research concerning the important, yet falsely dated letters *Da Lü Bogong shu* #56, *Da Pan Gongshu* #7, and *Da Pan Wenshu shu* #2 (in *Zhu Wengong wenji* 34/4b, 50/20b, and 50/2b) has been confirmed by Chen Lai, *Zhu Xi shuxin biannian kaozheng*, pp. 153, 244–245.

¹⁴ For details see my paper quoted in n. 6, pp. 730ff.

¹⁵ For instance in Liu Ke's 劉克 (fl. 13th c.) *Shi shuo* 詩說 (ed. Suzhou: Yiyun shushe, 1828) and in Xie Fangde's 謝枋得 (1226–1289) *Shi zhuan zhushu* 詩傳註疏 (ed. CSJC 1727).

features not present in the early version, such as the indication of *fu* 賦, *bi* 比, *xing* 興, for each stanza, and some new interpretations such as, e.g., for Ode no. 26, *Bo zhou* 柏舟. On the other hand, it lacked some of the most striking features of the late version, i.e. (1) the re-arrangement of the so-called “six lost Odes” (*liu wang shi* 六亡詩), (2) the omission of the “Prefaces”, and (3) the interpretation of a larger number of Odes from *Wei* and *Zheng* as “depraved songs”, modelled on the interpretation of Ode no. 48, *Sang zhong* 桑中, in the middle version.¹⁶

With the discovery of the middle version, the early reception of Zhu Xi's *Shi jizhuan* and the development of *Shijing* studies in the Southern Song dynasty is placed in a completely new light. This leads us to question the time-honoured view of Zhu Xi's new *Shijing* interpretation as having defined the mainstream of “Odes” scholarship since the end of the 12th century. In reality, it was the still rather traditional middle version which was generally received up to the middle of the 13th century. It was not until half a century after Zhu Xi's death that the late version, containing the interpretations of the “depraved songs”, became gradually known to the scholarly community, striking it with dismay. Because the intellectual climate had been thoroughly changing since the turn of the thirteenth century,¹⁷ Zhu Xi's theory of the “depraved songs” could not be understood any more. Consequently, there was a twofold reaction to the embarrassing late version: on the one hand, Zhu Xi's acknowledgement of “depraved songs” was approved of by some, but contrary to his intention, they called for tabooing them: Wang Bo 王柏 (1197–1274) even argued for removing thirty “depraved songs” from the *Shijing*,¹⁸ on the other hand, Zhu Xi's new approach to the “Odes” was fiercely rejected, notably by Ma Duanlin 馬端臨 (1254–1325),¹⁹ whose influential critique paved the way for the restoration of the traditional *Shijing* exegesis in late Imperial China. As has been pointed out by Qu Wanli 屈萬里, the reason for this new turn in the history of *Shijing* scholarship is

¹⁶ See my paper quoted in n. 6, pp. 742–753. Only when a compilation of the fragments of the early and middle versions is made will we get a more substantial view of the differences between the three versions of Zhu Xi's *Shijing* commentary. I am in the process of preparing such a compilation, which I hope will be published in 1994.

¹⁷ A colourful picture of this turn is presented by Lin Shuen-fu, *The Transformation of the Chinese Lyrical Tradition. Chiang K'uei and Southern Sung 'Tz'u Poetry*, Princeton, 1978, pp. 3–48.

¹⁸ See *Shi yi* 詩義 (ed. CSJS 1726) 1/13–14. Cf. Cheng Yuanmin 程元敏, *Wang Bo zhi Shijingxue* 王伯之詩經學, Taipei, 1968, pp. 74–90.

¹⁹ See *Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考 (ed. Shanghai: Shangwu, 1936) 141/1244c–

nothing else but the headache caused by Zhu Xi's theory of the "depraved songs".²⁰

We may conclude that the discovery of the middle version not only clarifies the process of Zhu Xi's *Shijing* studies; in view of the early reception of this version, it also provides an explanation of the paradox, why the overwhelming majority of *Shijing* scholars from Yuan to Qing clung to the traditional hermeneutics even though the *Shi jizhuan* constituted the orthodox interpretation since 1315.

Zhu Xi's "Copernican Revolution" and the "Music to the Odes" in the Song dynasty

What brought about the change in Zhu Xi's readings of the "Odes"? My starting point in considering this question is the recently published article on "Poems of Depravity" by Wong Siu-kit and Lee Kar-shui.²¹ In this article, the authors draw attention to the dispute between Zhu Xi and Lü Zuqian about the notions of *Zheng* and *Ya* 雅, pointing out that this controversy eventually caused Zhu Xi to reach his view of the "Odes" as containing "depraved songs". While Lü regarded all Odes, including those from the sections *Wei* and *Zheng*, as having been set to "correct music" (*yayue* 雅樂) appropriate for court functions and ritual occasions, Zhu Xi understood *Ya* and *Zheng* as only referring to the Odes of the two *Ya* sections and the *Zheng* section of the *Guofeng* 國風 part. His argument required a thorough re-interpretation of Confucius' maxim, "There is no improper thinking" (*si wu xie* 思無邪). Traditionally understood as referring to the authors of the Odes, in Zhu Xi's argumentation it became related to the reader, leading to a most innovative insight into the relationship between the text and its recipient: "Zhu Xi at least managed to see that there were other identities than the text: like so many Chinese theorists, he knew that the author was an important agent (or medium), but unlike most Chinese theorists, he understood that the

1245a and 178/1539b–1543a. Wong Siu-kit and Lee Kar-shui, "Poems of Depravity", p. 215, n. 23, refer to "a certain Mr Ma of Po Yang", according to whom Zhu Xi regarded 24 songs depraved. This is of course none other than Ma Duanlin.

²⁰ See Qu Wanli, "Xian Qin shuo *Shi* de fengshang he Hanru yi *Shi* jiao shuo *Shi* de yuqu" 先秦說詩的風尚和漢儒以詩教說詩的迂曲, in *Qu Wanli xiansheng wencun* 屈萬里先生文存, 2 vols., Taipei: Linking, 1985, vol. 1, p. 222.

²¹ See above n. 10. This is a revised version of Huang Zhaojie 黃兆傑 and Li Jiashu 李家樹, "Song Zhu Xi, Lü Zuqian 'yinshi shuo' de lunzheng—Kongzi 'si wu xie' yi yu zai *Shijingxue* shang de huixiang" 宋朱熹、呂祖謙《淫詩說》的論爭—孔子《思無邪》一語在詩經學上的迴響, *Journal of Oriental Studies* 24 (1986), pp. 211–223.

reader was arguably an even more important agent (or medium)".²² In a way we may speak of this fresh insight on the part of Zhu Xi as the "Copernican Revolution" of the *Guofeng* hermeneutics.

In view of the controversy between Zhu and Lü, it becomes apparent that this "Copernican Revolution" has to be seen in the broader context of the rediscovery of the musical aspect of the "Odes" in the Song period. The history of this rediscovery is closely related to the reinforcement of the ideal of antiquity (*fugu* 復古) during the Neo-Confucian revival of the Northern Song period. Among its remains are twelve melodies to those Odes which were sung at the district wine drinking ritual (*xiang yinjiu li* 鄉飲酒禮) described in the *Yili* 儀禮 (Nos. 161–163, 170–172, 1–3, 12–13, and 15). The notations of these melodies were first given in the "Comprehensive Explanations to the Original Text and the Tradition of the *Yili*" (*Yili jingzhuan tongjie* 儀禮經傳通解), initiated by Zhu Xi in 1196, but posthumously expanded and completed by some of his disciples.²³ The controversy over the Tang or Song origin of the melodies aside, they are rare examples of the rather small amount of Chinese music which has been handed down to us from a period earlier than the 14th century. They were introduced to the West by Laurence Picken, who transcribed them into staff notation and analyzed them in musicological terms.²⁴

In *Shijing* exegesis, the problem of the music was raised as early as the beginning of the Tang dynasty, when the "Correct Interpretations of the *Mao Shi*" (*Mao Shi zhengyi* 毛詩正義) was compiled. Skeptical about the adequacy and reliability of language, the authors of the *Mao Shi zhengyi* had attributed great significance to the music, viewing it as the suitable medium to distinguish between correct and false intentions (*yi* 意), and thereby to determine the

²² Wong Siu-kit and Lee Kar-shui, p. 215. See also the discussion of *si wu xie* in the context of *Shijing* exegesis by Jiang Fan 蔣凡, "'Si wu xie' yu 'Zhengsheng yin' kaobian" 思無邪與鄭聲淫考辯, *Gudian wenxue luncong* 古典文學論叢 no. 3 (1982), pp. 42–65.

²³ See *Yili jingzhuan tongjie* (ed. *Siku quanshu zhenben* 四庫全書珍本 [hereafter *SKZB*] X/26–49), *Xueli* VII, 14/1a–8b. Liu Deyi 劉德義, *Zhongguo yinyue wenhua zhi huigu. Feng Ya shi'er shipu yanxi* 中國音樂文化之回顧, 風雅十二詩譜研析, Taipei: Zhongyang hechangtuan kejiao tushu, 1982, pp. 20ff., surveys the reproductions of these notations in the various editions of the *Yili jingzhuan tongjie* and in other works from Yuan to Qing. However, he failed to notice the notations contained in *Shi zhuan yishuo* 詩傳遺說 (ed. [*Jingyin Wenyuange*] *Siku quanshu* [景印文淵閣] 四庫全書 [hereafter *SKQS*], Taipei, 1983–85, vol. 75) 6/9b–16b. Concerning the *Yili jingzhuan tongjie*, see *Zhuji nianpu kaoyi* 4/338, *SK* 22/179a–b and *A Sung Bibliography*, ed. by Y. Hervouet, Hong Kong, 1978, p. 37.

²⁴ See Laurence Picken, "Twelve Ritual Melodies of the T'ang Dynasty", *Studia Memoriae Belae Bartók Sacra*, Budapest, 1956, pp. 147–173.

authentic meaning of each Ode.²⁵ As the music to the “Odes” had been lost by the Tang dynasty, however, the authors of the subcommentary were unknowingly exposing their own exegesis to harassing doubts about its authenticity.²⁶

The precarious state of the musical tradition struck the literati during the controversies over the regulation of the “correct music” appropriate for performances at court. Between 966 and 1104 there were six musical reforms altogether, which all provoked large-scale debates.²⁷ During these reforms, which aimed at restoring the ancient music and expelling the improper melodies of *Wei* and *Zheng*, the standards of measurement for the pitch pipes were changed, the bells were recast, certain instruments were added or eliminated. The climax of the Song court’s reform efforts was reached with the establishment of a separate music bureau (*dashengfu* 大晟府), which dominated the musical scene during the post-reform era and was closely connected with the ill-famed Cai Jing 蔡京 (1047–1126). Under its direction the general enthusiasm for antiquity prevalent in the reign of Emperor Huizong (1100–1125) became significant in the field of music.²⁸

The great efforts needed to reform the “correct music” reveal the deficiency of the court music tradition, which had severely suffered because of the An Lushan 安祿山 rebellion (756–763) and because of the disturbances of the Five Dynasties.²⁹ The deplorable condition of rites and music at the beginning of the Song dynasty may be

²⁵ See the explanations given to pericope no. 6 of the *Great Preface*, in *Mao Shi zhengyi* (ed. *Shisanjing zhushu* 十三經注疏, repr. 2 vols., Peking: Zhonghua, ¹1965, ²1981; hereafter *SSJZS*) 1/270a, h. 26ff. The passage, which is translated by Van Zoeren, pp. 142–143, concludes: “In some cases the words will be correct, and the intentions [yi] wrong; in some the words will be depraved, but the aim correct. Only one accomplished in music will know”.

²⁶ See the profound discussion by Van Zoeren, pp. 143–145.

²⁷ See *Songshi jishi benmo* 宋史紀事本末 (ed. 3 vols., Peking: Zhonghua, 1977) j. 28; Yang Yinliu 楊蔭瀏, *Zhongguo gudai yinyue shigao* 中國古代音樂史稿, 2 vols., Peking: Renmin yinyue, ¹1981, ²1985, vol. 1, pp. 385–395; Rulan Chao Pian, *Song Dynasty Musical Sources and Their Interpretation*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1967, pp. 1–7.

²⁸ For instance, the court orchestra was instructed in 1117 to practice the songs of Shun 舜 and Gaoyao 皋陶 and the “Songs of the five Sons” (*wu zi zhi ge* 五子之歌), all recorded in the *Shangshu* 商書 (ed. *SSJZS*; see James Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, 5 vols. [repr. Hong Kong, 1961], vol. 3, pp. 89–90 and pp. 156–161), and the Odes nos. 301, 1, 11–12, 25, 235, and 266. These songs were considered as representative music of the Golden Age and the Three Dynasties (Xia, Shang, and Zhou). See *Song shi* 宋史 (ed. Peking: Zhonghua, 1977) 129/3019.

²⁹ See Martin Gimm, *Das Yüeh-fu tsa-lu des Tuan An-chieh*, Wiesbaden, 1966, pp. 135–136, n. 19, and Vladislav Sissaouri, *Cosmos, magie et politique. La musique ancienne de la Chine et du Japon*, Paris, 1992, pp. 61–63. Both accounts draw on the

may be seen, for instance, from the fact that the regulations from the Zhenguan era (627–649) concerning the district wine drinking ritual had disappeared throughout the empire except in Mingzhou 明州 (Ningbo).³⁰ Apparently in the context of its re-enactment in the Chunhua era (990–994), six new Odes with altogether 33 stanzas were composed, all bearing titles of *Shijing* songs and being modelled on their originals in style and content.³¹ As in the case of many bronze vessels produced in the ancient style during the Song period, this curiosity was obviously not a “forgery”, only a fanciful imitation.

The so-called “Music to the Odes” (*Shi yue* 詩樂), treated in the Song dynastic history (j. 142), may be viewed as having been created in the same spirit of fancy to antiquity.³² The leading figure in this new field appears to have been Hu Yuan 胡瑗 (993–1059),³³ a leader of the *fugu* movement and the co-author of an important work on music, the “Illustrations and Notes on the New Music of the Huangyou Era” (*Huangyou xinyue tuji* 皇祐新樂圖記).³⁴ Hu Yuan is said to have edited a now lost music book of “correct melodies” (*Yayin pu* 雅音譜), which contained more than ten melodies to Odes from the *Shijing*.³⁵ This music book was later obtained by Zhang Zai

pioneering work by Kishibe Shigeo 岸邊成雄, *Tōdai ongaku no rekishiteki kenkyū* 唐代音樂の歴史的研究, 2 vols., Tōkyō 1960/61. See also Yang Yinliu, *Zhongguo gudai yinyue shigao*, I, pp. 246–251.

³⁰ See *Song shi* 114/2721.

³¹ See *Song shi* 139/3295–7; *Song huiyao jigao* 宋會要輯稿 (repr. 8 vols., Peking: Zhonghua, 1957), Yue VII, pp. 29a–31a.

³² See Yang Yinliu I, p. 383.

³³ See *Songren zhuanji ziliao suoyin* 宋人傳記資料索引, ed. by Chang Bide 昌彼得 et al., 6 vols., Taipei: Dingwen, 1974–84 (hereafter *SRSY*), pp. 1570–2; R.C. Pian, in *Sung Biographies*, ed. H. Franke, 4 vols., München, 1976, pp. 444–445.

³⁴ This work contained the theoretical foundations of the music reform of 1050. See Rulan Chao Pian, pp. 3–4.

³⁵ See *Du Shi ji* 1/8, where a letter of Lü Dajun 呂大鈞 (1031–1082) to a certain Liu Shou 劉壽 is quoted. In this letter Lü tells that he had started to practice the district drinking wine ritual and the ceremony of the district archery meeting with people from his native place. Regarding the *Shijing* songs required for these two ceremonies—altogether nineteen (see *Yili* [ed. SSJZS] IV [*Xiang yinjiu li*] 9/986a–b and V [*Xiang she li*] 11/996a, 12/1005a, 13/1011c; transl. by John Steele, *The I-li or Book of Etiquette and Ceremonial*, 2 vols., repr. Taipei, 1966, vol. 1, pp. 61–63, 82–83, 105, 119)—they used Hu Yuan’s *Yayin pu*. However, it contained only a little more than ten musical arrangements. Seven were still missing, notably for the Odes nos. 172a–c, 170a–c, and 25 (*You geng*, *Chong qiu*, *You li*, *Nan gai*, *Bai hua*, *Hua shu*, and *Zou yu*). From this it follows that Hu Yuan’s music book contained twelve melodies, viz. to Odes nos. 161–163, 170–172, 1–3, 12–13, and 15. With the exception of the *Zou yu*, the nineteen Odes were also used for the ceremonial

張載 (1020–1078), one of the five Neo-Confucian masters from the Northern Song period. Zhang proposed that the literati should practice the *Shijing* songs contained therein day and night and that the court should use them for sacrificial ceremonies.³⁶ Moreover, Zhang instructed his family to sing Odes from the *Zhounan* 周南 and *Shaonan* 召南 sections.³⁷ Later, Hu Yuan's music book was handed down within Zhang Zai's school and used in connection with the district wine drinking ritual and the ceremony of the district archery meeting (*xiang she li* 鄉射禮).³⁸ According to Wang Yinglin 王應麟 (1223–1296) it was already lost by his time.³⁹ However, it seems very likely that the notations contained in the *Yili jingzhuān tongjie* were simply taken from Hu Yuan's music book, for in each case exactly the same Odes are set to music.⁴⁰

Information on the origin of Hu Yuan's melodies is scarce and we only know that Zhang Zai referred to them as “transmitted melodies” (*yisheng* 遺聲).⁴¹ More precise is the note appended to the notations in the *Yili jingzhuān tongjie*. In this note we are told that the notations had been transmitted by a contemporary of Zhu Xi, a certain Zhao Yansu 趙彥肅 (*jìnshi* 進士 between 1165–1174), who had allegedly taken them from the “Ritual Regulations of the District Drinking Wine Ceremony” of the Kaiyuan era (713–741).⁴² Picken has argued in favor of this alleged mid-Tang origin of the

banquet and the great archery meeting at the king's court or at the court of a feudal prince, cf. *Yili* VI (*Yanli*) 15/1021b and VII (*Dashe li*) 17/1033c, 1034a (Steele I, pp. 136–138, 164).

³⁶ See *Song shi* 142/3339 and *Kunxue jiwen* 困學紀聞 (ed. ZGXSMTZ 721–723) 3/149.

³⁷ See *Jingxue liku: Zi dao*, in *Zhang Zai ji* 張載集 (ed. Peking: Zhonghua, 1978), p. 291.

³⁸ See the letter of Lü Dajun cited in n. 30 above. Lü Dajun and his brother Dalin 大臨 were the leading disciples of Zhang Zai, see *Song Yuan xue'an* 宋元學案 (ed. ZGXSMTZ 333–335) 31/629–639.

³⁹ See *Kunxue jiwen* 3/149.

⁴⁰ Concerning Hu Yuan's music book, this may be deduced from Lü Dajun's letter, see n. 35 above.

⁴¹ See *Kunxue jiwen* 3/149.

⁴² See *Yili jingzhuān tongjie* 14/8a–b. Zhu Xi corresponded with Zhao Yansu, who did not directly belong to his disciples (see Chen Rongjie 陳榮捷, *Zhuzi menren* 朱子門人, Taipei: Xuesheng, 1982, p. 292). There are seven letters written by him to Zhao between 1184 and 1186 (in *Zhu Wengong wenji*, 56/1a–4b; regarding the dating of these letters see Chen Lai, *Zhuzi shuxin*, pp. 250–251 and pp. 294–295), but the notations of the twelve melodies are not mentioned in any of them. In two letters Zhu Xi speaks of an illustrated work about the rites (*Li tu* 禮圖), which he had received from Zhao (see *Da Zhao Ziqin* #5 and #7, in *Zhu Wengong wenji* 56/3a, h. 7 and 3b, h. 24). Apparently Picken

twelve melodies,⁴³ whereas Yang Yinliu and Rulan Chao Pian—likewise on account of musical considerations—have raised doubts about their pre-Song origin.⁴⁴

This unsolved controversy cannot be settled here. Yet it should be noted that there is evidence that the above-mentioned note in the *Yili jingzhuan tongjie* had not been written by Zhu Xi himself, but by a disciple of his, and had been inserted posthumously.⁴⁵ Furthermore, Zhu strongly objected to the usage of the specific mode and key given for six melodies, pointing out that it would not agree to the standards of antiquity (*fei gu* 非古).⁴⁶ His connoisseurship in music reveals a definite sentiment against the archaistic tendencies in contemporary music,⁴⁷ including the efforts at restoring the

149) refers to this in his statement that “The writings of *Chao* . . . were extensively used by *Chu Hsi* as a source of information on matters of ritual”. Had it been Zhao Yansu who transmitted the twelve *Shijing* melodies, the assertion of their alleged origin in the Kaiyuan wine drinking ritual would gain in credibility with regard to Zhao’s experience in ritual matters. This, however, is not the case because the reference to Zhao Yansu in the *Yili jingzhuan tongjie* is a false identification, as the two “recorded conversations” in *Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類 (ed. 8 vols., Peking: Zhonghua, 1986) 92/2347–8 give Zhao Zijing 趙子敬 as the name of the person from whom Zhu Xi had received the notations. Zhao Yansu’s style was Ziqin 子欽, not Zijing.

⁴³ See Picken, p. 149, where he only questions the ascription of the melodies in particular to the Kaiyuan era: “*Chu Hsi* states that his text derives from the Sung scholar, *Chao Yen-su*, who had the songs from a source dating from the K’ai-yüan period. . . . There is no reason to doubt *Chu Hsi*’s ascription of the transmission of the songs to *Chao*, but in view of the ‘Golden Age’ halo which hung about the K’ai-yüan period already in Sung times, the ascription of the songs to precisely that period can only be accepted with reservations.” This discussion rests upon a misreading of the above-mentioned note in the *Yili jingzhuan tongjie*: it is not Zhu Xi’s information concerning Zhao’s transmission of the melodies which is by hearsay (*yun* 云), but their ascription to the Kaiyuan era which is regarded by Zhu as an unproven assumption, expressed by the particle *yun*, which refers to the second and not to the first sentence. The “recorded conversation” in *Zhuzi yulei* 92/2347, h. 8ff., in which Zhu Xi remarks that the notations were sent him by Zhao, provides evidence for the reading proposed.

⁴⁴ See Yang Yinliu I, p. 384; Rulan Chao Pian, p. 10 n. 47.

⁴⁵ The reason for this is that the identification of Zhao Yansu as the person credited with the transmission of the melodies is incorrect (see n. 42) and the reference to Zhao by his personal name instead of his style infringes the name taboo, strictly observed by Zhu Xi throughout his commentaries.

⁴⁶ In particular, Zhu Xi objected to the usage of the octave of the pitch-pipe *huangzhong* 黃鐘 as the fundamental for the melody in the *gong* 宮 mode: see the two “recorded conversations” cited in n. 42 above. For a discussion of Zhu’s view, see Picken, pp. 169–170.

⁴⁷ See e.g. his remarks on the music created under Cai Jing, cf. *Zhuzi yulei* 92/2345, h. 5–6 and h. 7.

music to the “Odes”. Such efforts were made, for instance, by Zhan Tiren 詹體仁 (1143–1206).⁴⁸ Zhu Xi found fault with Zhan’s reliance on the tunes used for the music at court, pointing out that the result was only “contemporary music” (*jinyue* 近樂).⁴⁹ Nor did the music of wind-instruments composed by Zhan for *Feng* 風 and *Ya* Odes find Zhu’s favor: “When you first listen to the *Er Nan* 二南 Odes, it is still acceptable. But when later the Odes (of the decade of) *Wenwang* 文王 [nos. 235–244] are played, the melodies are all without style.”⁵⁰

Zhu Xi’s reluctance toward these compositions originated in his keen understanding of the fact that from the Han dynasty onwards the *ancient* music had become so strongly intermingled with “barbarian music” (*huyue* 胡樂) that there was no prospect to recover it.⁵¹

The music of today is wholly barbarian music. Even the (improper) *Zheng* and *Wei* music of antiquity does not exist anymore. Though there are some people today who have the *Guanju* [Ode no. 1], the *Luming* [Ode no. 161] and other Odes set to music. But when you hear them, they are not different from popular music (*suyue* 俗樂) and one does not know how the ancient music (*guyue* 古樂) sounded.⁵²

In view of this critical attitude towards the contemporary music to *Shijing* songs, it seems unlikely that the “Odes” were sung in Zhu Xi’s academy, as suggested by a panegyric of Han Yuanji 韓元吉 (1118–1183), a close friend of Zhu’s.⁵³ In fact, throughout his writings and “recorded conversations”, Zhu Xi says nothing on the singing of the “Odes”, though he frequently stresses the importance of their being “read-to-maturity” (*shudu* 熟讀) and repeatedly recited (*fengsong* 諷誦) in order to make up for the unretrievable loss

⁴⁸ Zhan, who came from Pucheng/Jian’an (Fujian), had been Vice Minister of the Court of Imperial Sacrifices (*taichang shaoqing* 太常少卿), which generally was responsible for the conduct of major state sacrificial ceremonies. See *SRSY*, pp. 3281–2; Chen Rongjie, p. 284.

⁴⁹ See *Zhuzi yulei* 92/2343–2344.

⁵⁰ See *Zhuzi yulei* 92/2343.

⁵¹ Concerning the diffusion of “correct music” and “barbarian music” in the Song period see Huang Xiangpeng 黃翔鵬, “Liang Song huyi lixiang yiyin chutan” 兩宋胡夷里巷遺音初探, *Zhongguo wenhua* 中國文化 no. 4 (Hongkong, 1991), pp. 148–156.

⁵² *Zhuzi yulei* 92/2347, h. 2–3.

⁵³ According to Han, lyrics from the *Shijing* and the *Chuci* 楚辭 were sung (*ge* 歌) by Zhu Xi’s disciples in his private academy located in the Wuyi mountain region. See *Wuyi jingshe ji* 武夷精舍記, in *Songdai sanwen xuanzhu* 宋代散文選注, ed. by Wang Shuizhao 王水照, Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1978, pp. 148–152. This record is not to be found in Han Yuanji’s collected writings, the *Nanrun jiyi gao* 南潤甲乙稿 (ed. CSJC 1979–84). In view of Zhu Xi’s reluctance toward the newly

of the ancient melodies.⁵⁴ The awareness of this loss, also expressed in the late version of his *Shi jizhuan*,⁵⁵ was constituent of his approach to the “Odes”.

The loss of the *Shijing* melodies was also acknowledged by Wang Zhi 王質 (1135–1189), who is generally considered to be the author of the commentary entitled “Comprehensive Knowledge of the Odes” (*Shi zong wen* 詩總聞), though this ascription may not be true (see below). In a letter dated 1185 Wang states:

During the Sui and Tang dynasties, in the region between the Yellow River and the Fen River [i.e. in Shanxi], some Odes were still sung, or sung in response. During the Xuan(he) and Zheng(he) eras [1111–1125] there was Mr Dou 竇, a man from the countryside, who still could perform the “Odes”. Thus, it is not so long ago that the melodies were lost!⁵⁶

Toward a new understanding of the “Odes”: Zheng Qiao 鄭樵, Lin Guangzhao 林光朝, Chen Zhirou 陳知柔

The last part of Wang Zhi’s statement obviously refers to an account in the *Shi zong wen*, in which there is a lively description of the performance of Ode no. 161, *Lu ming*, by Mr Dou, with the additional remark by its author that he had been only sixteen years old (*sui* 歲) when he had met this man in Wuchang 武昌.⁵⁷ From this account, which must have been written by someone born before the downfall of the Northern Song dynasty, it is evident that Wang Zhi certainly was not the author of the *Shi zong wen*, but someone of the generation of Zheng Qiao (1104–1162),⁵⁸ who was

composed *Shijing* melodies it seems likely that he rather preferred a musical arrangement of the district drinking wine ceremony, which did not use the *Shijing* songs prescribed in the *Yili*. He had been sent such an arrangement by Lin Li 林栗 (*jinshi* 1142; cf. *Sung Biographies*, pp. 610–612). See *Da Lin Huangzhong* #3, in *Zhu Wengong wenji* 37/28a.

⁵⁴ See, for instance, *Shi zhuan yishuo* 1/19a: “In antiquity the scholars of the Odes could rely on the melodies. But today they are all lost. What can be done about that? The only way is to read-to-maturity and to recite (the Odes).”

⁵⁵ See *Shi jizhuan* (ed. SBCK II/7–8) 1/5a.

⁵⁶ *Yu Zhou shumi Yigong*, in: *Xueshan ji* 雪山集 (ed. CSJC 1990–2) 8/100–101.

⁵⁷ See *Shi zong wen* (ed. CSJC 1712–1715) 9/152.

⁵⁸ For Zheng’s biography cf. *SRSY*, pp. 3674–5. In addition, a research project on Zheng Qiao was carried out by the History Department of Xiamen University in the early 60’s, bringing to light materials unknown until then. See “Zheng Qiao lishi diaocha baogao” 鄭樵歷史調查報告, 2 parts, *Xiamen daxue xuebao* 廈門大學學報 1963: 4, pp. 19–27, 28–40; Xiamen daxue lishixi Zheng Qiao yanjiu xiaozu (ed.), *Zheng Qiao yanjiu cankao ziliao* 鄭樵研究參考資料 no. 1 (1963) (*neibu* 內部 publication). For studies on Zheng Qiao in Western languages, see Hoyt C. Tillman, “Encyclopedias, Polymaths, and Tao-hsüeh Confucians: Pre-

the leading proponent of the musical aspect of the “Odes”. Taking a closer look at the *Shi zong wen*, which has been judged to be the most iconoclastic *Shijing* commentary of the Song period,⁵⁹ leads to the thesis that it certainly had been influenced by Zheng’s commentary, which has not been handed down to us.⁶⁰

Leaving this thesis aside, I will here for the most part draw upon materials which were the work of Zheng Qiao, namely the fragments of his famous treatise entitled “Critique of the Absurdities Concerning (the Exegesis of) the Odes” (*Shi bian wang* 詩辨妄) (also lost) and the materials contained in his “All-Embracing Records” (*Tongzhi* 通志).⁶¹ After a brief outline of his major contributions concerning the *Shijing* exegesis I will add some notes on his motive for emphasizing the musical aspect and on the influence of his new approach upon the contemporary *Shijing* scholarship.⁶²

“The main point of the *Odes* is their musical setting (*yuezhang* 樂章), not the meaning of their texts (*wenyi* 文義)”⁶³—this was

liminary Reflections With Special Reference to Chang Ju-yü”, *Journal of Sung-Yuan Studies* 22 (1990–92), pp. 89–90 n. 1.

⁵⁹ See e.g. SK 15/122, h. 13–14.

⁶⁰ For a discussion of this thesis, see my forthcoming book *Das Shi-jing-Studium in der Song-Zeit (960–1279). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Song-Klassikergelehrsamkeit*, Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994 (*Münchener ostasiatische Studien*).

⁶¹ These materials were put together by Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 in his compilation *Shi bian wang* (*Fulu si zhong*) 詩辨妄 (附錄四種), Peiping: Pushe, 1933. Concerning the materials included in the work *Liujing aolun* 六經奧論, which is traditionally attributed to Zheng Qiao, but certainly was compiled at a later date (see *ibid.*, pp. 79–84), Gu singled out nine sections which could have been written by Zheng (*ibid.*, pp. 84–100). To my view, however, this may be true only for the selected section no. 6. On the other hand, there are some passages cited in Song commentaries and collective works on the classics which can be identified as having originated with Zheng Qiao, but which were not taken into consideration by Gu, such as, for instance, the two passages cited in *Shantang kaosuo* 山堂考索 (ed. SKQS, vol. 938), *Bieji* 7/3b–8b and 7/14a–16a. The first passage contains a fierce attack on the “Preface”, the second refutes the traditional notions of *zheng* 正 and *bian* 變. For a discussion of these hitherto neglected materials and their authenticity, see my forthcoming book (n. 60 above).

⁶² Research concerning Zheng Qiao’s studies of the *Shijing* has not gone beyond Gu Jiegang (1933). The article by Ruan Tingzhuo 阮廷焯, “Zheng Qiao *Shi bian wang* kaoji” 鄭樵詩辨妄考輯, *Lianhe shuyuan xuebao* 聯合書院學報 7 (1968/69), pp. 149–158, was apparently written without knowing Gu’s compilation. It was simply plagiarized by Yu Weijie 于維杰 in his article “Zheng Qiao *Shixue* kao” 鄭樵詩學考, *Chenggong daxue xuebao* 成功大學學報 16 (1981), pp. 1–29. The most comprehensive account of Zheng Qiao’s *Shijing* studies, largely based upon Gu’s compilation, is to be found in Huang Zhongshen 黃忠慎, *Nan Song san jia Shijingxue* 南宋三家詩經學, Taipei: Shangwu, 1988, pp. 4–97. In a Western language see the outline by Van Zoeren, pp. 223–227.

⁶³ *Ji Fang libu shu*, in *Jiaji yigao* 夾漈遺稿 (ed. CSJC 1985) 2/13. For a similar

Zheng Qiao's basic idea, which led him to perceive the "Odes" as popular songs of antiquity:

The "Odes" depend on the melodies and not on the texts. It's like today when new songs come up in the cities and the people in the streets and alleys vie in singing them. Is it because the texts are so beautiful? I suppose just because the melodies are new!⁶⁴

Examining the tradition of the "Odes" as songs being sung or performed, Zheng Qiao came to the conclusion that none of the melodies to *Shijing* songs had been passed on after the Western Jin period (265–316).⁶⁵ He blamed the Han scholars, whose scholarship had been marred by their strife for official tutelage, for the loss of the *Shijing* melodies. Sticking to the letter, they had ruthlessly discarded the melodies, thereby perverting Confucius' teachings of the "Odes". Consequently, Zheng arrived at the most radical criticism of the Mao-Zheng commentary, notably of the "Prefaces", thereby threatening to erode the traditional *Shijing* exegesis to its very foundations.

Zheng Qiao's new approach to the "Odes" centered around the idea that the *Shijing* was a collection of songs arranged by Confucius according to their melodies.⁶⁶ From this idea Zheng deduced the definitions of the terms denoting the three *Shijing* sections *Feng*, *Ya*, and *Song* 頌, which he explained strictly in accordance to their musical usage: *Feng* as songs to the music in a particular region, *Ya* as songs sung and performed during various rituals at court, and *Song* as songs used in the ancestral temple.⁶⁷ These redefinitions had far-reaching repercussions, challenging various key doctrines of the traditional exegesis. Concerning the *Feng* section, Zheng considered the *Zhounan* and the *Shaonan* to be songs from the Huai-Yangzi region instead of Odes constituting the so-called "normative canon" (*zhengjing* 正經),⁶⁸ and regarded the *Wangfeng* 王風 and the *Binfeng* 邶風 as songs set to airs from the Luo and the Guanzhong region instead of relegated *Ya* Odes or songs which almost had the status of *Ya* Odes.⁶⁹ Concerning the *Ya* section, Zheng was the first

phrase see *Tongzhi* (ed. Shanghai: Shangwu, 1936), *Yue lue* I, 49/626a, h. 25–26.

⁶⁴ See *Tongzhi*, *Yue lue* I, 49/626a, h. 25–27.

⁶⁵ See *Tongzhi*, *Yue lue* I, 49/625a, h. 15–26 and 49/626a–b.

⁶⁶ See *Tongzhi*, *Yue lue* I, 49/625b, h. 2–10, 626a, h. 27–626b, h. 4, and 633c, h. 5–6; *Kunchong caomu lue* I, 75/715a, h. 14ff.

⁶⁷ See *Tongzhi*, *Yue lue* I, 49/625a–626a, here: p. 656a–b. See also *ibid.*, *Kunchong caomu lue* I, 75/865a, h. 25–26.

⁶⁸ See *Tongzhi*, *Kunchong caomu lue* I, 75/865b, h. 1ff.

⁶⁹ See *Tongzhi*, *Kunchong caomu lue* I, 75/715b, h. 4–6. See also *Shi bian wang* no. 26 (Gu Jiegang [comp.], p. 32).

to explain the difference between the *Minor Ya* (*Xiao Ya* 小雅) and the *Major Ya* (*Da Ya* 大雅) Odes in terms of different musical settings, brushing aside the speculation that they were related to important and less important affairs of the state.⁷⁰ Finally, Zheng argued that the so-called “six lost Odes”, for which only the titles exist, were merely music scores originally without texts and not songs that were lost during the prohibition of books under Qin Shihuangdi.⁷¹

Drawing upon these redefinitions, Zheng Qiao attacked the classification of the “Odes” as “normative” (*zheng* 正) and “deviating” (*bian* 變)—two notions that were at the core of the moralistic exegesis.⁷² Exposing the inconsistency of these two notions, Zheng diminished the elevated status of the *Er Nan* Odes, pointing out that some of them, e.g. Ode no. 24, *He bi nong yi* 何彼穠矣, certainly did not originate from the glorious founding era of the Western Zhou, and that others dwelt on themes, e.g. the seduction of the girl in Ode no. 23, *Ye you si jun* 野有死麇, which disqualified them from being called “normative”. On the other hand, one could by no means classify all Odes from the following *Guofeng* sections as “deviating” because a number of them were in praise of a prince

⁷⁰ See *Tongzhi*, *Yue lue* I, 49/625b, h. 6: “(Confucius) separated the two *Ya*, the *Major* and the *Minor*, in order to set forth that the melodies used at court were different.” In *Liujing aolun* (ed. *SKQS*, vol. 184) 3/9a, the difference between the *Major* and *Minor Ya* is further explained by the distinction between the major and minor of the twelve pitch-pipes (*lü* 呂), which alludes to the legend of Ling Lun 伶倫 who was said to have created the twelve pitch-pipes by imitating the sounds of the male and female phoenix, thus obtaining six *yang* 陽 and six *yin* 陰 pitch-pipes. See Richard Wilhelm (trans.), *Frühling und Herbst des Lü Bu We*, Düsseldorf & Köln, 1979, p. 64; Walter Kaufmann, *Musical References in the Chinese Classics*, Detroit, 1976, p. 150.

⁷¹ See *Tongzhi*, *Zongxu*, p. 2c; *Yue lue* I, 49/628c, h. 4–11; *Shi bian wang* nos. 4 and 32 (Gu Jiegang [comp.], p. 19, 37). See also the passage cited under Zheng’s name in *Mao Shi jijie* 毛詩集解 (ed. *SKQS*, vol. 71) 20/28b–29a and in *Shi shuo* (cf. n. 15 above) 7/16a. Zheng’s thesis, which had also been put forward by Dong You 董迥 (*jinshi*. 1124) (see *Du Shi ji* 18/320), evoked Zhu Xi’s re-arrangement of the first two decades of the *Minor Ya* according to the order derived from the *Yili*. See *Shi jizhuan* 9/22b ff. The precedent for such a re-arrangement, however, had been set by Su Che 蘇轍 (1039–1112) and Lü Zuqian, who adopted the order given by the “Preface” to Ode no. 177, *Liu yue*. The current relevance of the issue of the “six lost Odes” in contemporary scholarly discourse is attested by a note in *Rongzhai suibi* 容齋隨筆 (ed. Shanghai: Shangwu, 1935 [*Guoxue jiben congshu* 國學基本叢書], Xubi, 15/145).

⁷² The notions *zheng* and *bian* are introduced in the “Great Preface”, pericope no. 12. The division classifying the *Feng*, *Xiao Ya*, *Da Ya*, and *Song* Odes according to “normative” and “deviating” can be traced back to *Shi pu* 詩譜 (ed. *SSJZS*), p. 264, h. 25b, p. 402b, h. 12a–b and p. 403b, h. 3a.

and his good government. Due to the misconception of the terms *zheng* and *bian*, many “Prefaces” to the Odes from the *Feng* and *Ya* sections had turned the intentions of the songs upside down.⁷³ Regarding Ode no. 76, *Jiang Zhongzi* 將仲子, Zheng made a step even further by regarding it as a love song instead of a song directed against Duke Zhuang of Zheng (r. 744–701 B.C.). He was the first to use the notion of “depraved song” with reference to this Ode.⁷⁴

We get a glimpse of the dynamics inherent in Zheng Qiao’s exegesis focused on sounds by looking at his new interpretation of the first Ode *Guan ju*, notably its first line *guanguan jujiu* 關關雎鳩. According to the traditional commentaries it had to be read as “*Guan, guan* cry the ospreys”. Zheng Qiao, however, did not agree with this reading, stating that an osprey’s sharp beak is incapable of articulating the sound *guanguan* 關關. Only a bird with a broad and flat beak cries *guanguan*. Therefore a *jujiu* 雎鳩 was not an osprey but a common mallard duck.⁷⁵ Because of the ornithological misconception about the *jujiu*, the poetic image of the first line had been totally misinterpreted by the traditional commentators. They had understood it as being an image of the faithful feelings of Wenwang’s wife Taisi toward her husband because the union of the male and female osprey was said to be of long duration. According to Zheng Qiao, however, the crying duck on the island in the middle of the river was a poetic image introducing the “beautiful girl” (*shunü* 淑女) who cannot be reached by her lover. The main theme of the whole song is thus introduced in the opening line.⁷⁶

As may be seen from his re-interpretation of the *Guan ju* Ode, Zheng Qiao’s emphasis on “sound” (*sheng* 聲) had more facets than his definitions of *Feng*, *Ya*, and *Song* with reference to music. Another facet of his emphasis on “sound” was his paramount concern with phonetics in his philological studies. Thus Zheng Qiao clearly took a stance opposed to Wang Anshi 王安石 (1021–1086) and the etymology elaborated in his “Explanation of Characters” (*Zi shuo* 字說).⁷⁷ Furthermore, Zheng Qiao fiercely attacked

⁷³ See the two passages cited in *Shantang kaosuo*, *Bieji* (cf. n. 61).

⁷⁴ See *Shi jizhuan* 4/13a and *Zhuzi yulei* 23/539.

⁷⁵ See *Tongzhi*, *Kunzhong caomu lue* 1, 75/715b, h. 15–18. See also *ibid.*, 76/882a, h. 17–18.

⁷⁶ See *Shi bian wang* no. 45 (Gu Jiegang [comp.], p. 44).

⁷⁷ In this work the meaning of each word was deduced by breaking down the character to its component graphs, totally neglecting the dominant role played by the phonetical aspect in the evolution of the Chinese script. See Xu Shiyi 徐時儀, “Wang Anshi *Zi shuo* de wenxian jiazhi shulue” 王安石〈字說〉的文獻價值述略, in *Wenxian* 1993: 2, pp. 199–213. A compilation of fragments of the *Zi shuo* was

the trend towards “discursive expositions” (*yili* 義理) of the classics, calling instead for an exegetical approach to the “real facts” (*qing-zhuang* 情狀).⁷⁸ As in the case of his phonetical studies, this attack was also primarily directed against Wang Anshi’s “(New) Commentaries of Three Classics” (*San jing [xin]yi* 三經 [新] 義), which were known as a model of this new exegetical style. It is evident that Zheng Qiao’s emphasis on the musical aspect of the “Odes” also has to be seen in the context of his opposition to the “(New) Commentaries” which prevailed as the undisputed state orthodoxy at the time of his adolescence.⁷⁹

Wang’s *Shijing* commentary had a major impact on the *Shijing* exegesis of the 12th century.⁸⁰ Though known as one of the three “New Commentaries”,⁸¹ it was in fact a rigorous reinforcement of the traditional exegesis. Transforming the political ethics of the Han commentators into a “unified moralistic system” (*yidaode*

published by Hu Shuangbao 胡雙寶, in *Guji zhengli yu yanjiu* 古籍整理與研究 1987: 2, pp. 158–181. On the significance of the *Zi shuo* for Wang Anshi’s worldview, see Winston W. Lo, “Wang An-shih and the Confucian Ideal of ‘Inner-Sageliness’”, *Philosophy East and West* 26.1 (1976), pp. 41–53, here pp. 46ff.

⁷⁸ Zheng’s hermeneutic is most fully elaborated in his foreword to his commentary of the *Erya* (ed. CSJC 1141).

⁷⁹ It is noteworthy that Zheng Qiao’s cousin and fellow-scholar, Zheng Hou 鄭厚 (1100?–1160?), took the provincial examinations together with Lin Zhiqi 林之奇 (1112–1176) and Li Shu 李樗 (ca. 1115–?), all three of them being known for their opposition to Wang Anshi’s “New Learning”, see *Puyang bishi* 莆陽比事 (ed. [Xuan]yin) *Wanwei biechang* 選匱宛委別藏) 3/4a,b. For Lin’s criticism of the “New Commentaries” and of the attempt to reinstate them in the curriculum of the examinations, see his biography in *Song shi* 433/12861. Li Shu was the author of the *Mao Shi xiangjie* 毛詩詳解 (incorporated into *Mao Shi jijie*, cf. n. 71), in which the tendency to rebuke Wang’s interpretations of the “Odes” is very obvious.

⁸⁰ This may be seen from the fact that it is quoted in abundance in Lǔ Zuqian’s *Du Shi ji*, in frequency second only to Zhu Xi’s commentary. To this day, however, the tremendous influence of the “New Commentaries” in general and the “(New) Commentary on the Odes” (*Shi [xin]yi* 詩 [新] 義) in particular has been grossly underestimated, e.g. by Van Zoeren, p. 277 n. 9, who believes that “Wang’s influence on classical studies was minimal”. Due to this underestimation of Wang’s *Shijing* commentary, the context of the rediscovery of the musical aspect of the “Odes” has not been realized.

⁸¹ According to Winston W. Lo, p. 47, Wang Anshi chose to call his commentaries “*xinyi*” 新義 (new interpretations) because he was convinced that he had inaugurated a new era in the study of the classics. This thesis, however, may not be true. Reading through Wang’s writings, it appears that in fact he neither spoke of his new interpretations, nor of his “New Learning” (*xinxue* 新學). The latter term was first used by his political opponents, notably by Su Dongpo 蘇東坡 (1037–1101) in obvious allusion to the “New Dynasty” of Wang Mang 王莽 in order to discredit Wang Anshi.

一道德),⁸² one of Wang's primary concerns in interpreting the "Odes" was to place the *Guofeng* sections and in particular each Ode of the *Zhounan* section in a moralistic grid in order to determine their proper moral value.⁸³ For this purpose he drew heavily upon the "Prefaces". Thus, Wang strove to reinstall their authority, after they had come under attack, notably by Ouyang Xiu.⁸⁴ Wang proposed the theory that the "Prefaces" had originated in distant antiquity, having been written down by the state historians (*guoshi* 國史), and later been transmitted by Confucius and Zixia 子夏.⁸⁵ With this theory he even went beyond the traditional view held by the authors of the *Mao Shi zhengyi*, according to which Zixia was to be regarded as the author of the "Prefaces". In line with this conservative outlook regarding the "Prefaces", Wang had expressed the opinion that sounds and melodies (*shengyin* 聲音) were subordinated to "scripture" (*wen* 文). Consequently, one could not rely on them to reach an understanding of the Odes.⁸⁶

It is significant that the earliest reference to Zheng Qiao in one of the contemporary exegetical works on the *Shijing*, namely, in Li Shu's "Detailed Interpretation of the *Mao Shi*" (*Mao Shi xiangjie* 毛詩詳解), is made with regard to his emphasis on the musical aspect as opposed to Wang Anshi's downgrading of sounds and melodies.⁸⁷ Regarding Zheng Qiao's attack on the "Prefaces", we have in fact no evidence of its reception prior to several "recorded

⁸² On this notion and its foremost significance for Wang Anshi's intellectual outlook see Wang Mingsun 王明蓀, "Wang Anshi dui renxing zhi renshi ji qi yidaode shuo" 王安石對人性之認識及其一道德說, *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Sung History (Guoji Songshi yantaohui lunwenji* 國際宋史研討會論文集), Taipei: Zhongguo wenhua daxue, 1988, pp. 211–228.

⁸³ See *Guofeng jie* 國風解 and *Zhounan shi cijie* 周南詩次解. These two essays, which are found in Wang's collected writings, are reproduced by Qiu Hansheng 邱漢生 (comp.), *Shi yi gouchen* 詩義鉤沉, Peking: Zhonghua, 1982, p. 5, pp. 2–4, and by Cheng Yuanmin 程元敏 (comp.), *Sanjing xinyi jikao huiping* (2)—*Shijing* 三經新義輯考彙評(2)—詩經, Taipei: Guoli bianyiguan, 1986, pp. 120–123, pp. 19–20.

⁸⁴ Though Ouyang Xiu generally accepted the "Prefaces" as reliable guidelines for the exegesis, he was most critical of those to the Odes of the *Zhounan* and *Shaonan* sections, see *Shi benyi* 詩本義 (ed. SKQS, vol. 70), *Xu wen*, 14/13b–14b. According to a note by Liu Ke, Wang Anshi's interpretations of these Odes were extremely meticulous in their regard for the "Prefaces". See the quotation in Cheng Yuanmin (comp.), p. 30.

⁸⁵ See Cheng Yuanmin (comp.), pp. 5–6. On Wang Anshi's conservative view of the "Prefaces", see the introductory remarks by Qiu Hansheng (comp.), pp. vi–x.

⁸⁶ See Cheng Yuanmin (comp.), pp. 3–4; Qiu Hansheng (comp.), p. 8.

⁸⁷ See *Mao Shi jijie* 1/42b.

conversations” by Zhu Xi.⁸⁸ There is no doubt that the famous polemic “Condemnation of the *Shi bian wang*” (*Fei Shi bian wang* 非詩辨妄), attributed to Zhou Fu 周孚 (1135–1177) and heralded by the authors of the *SK* as a divine retaliation following blasphemous utterances,⁸⁹ was of much later origin.⁹⁰

Two scholars must be considered as having introduced Zheng Qiao’s *Shijing* studies to Zhu Xi. The first is Lin Guangzhao 林光朝 (1114–1178, *jinshi* 1163),⁹¹ who came from Putian 莆田, Xinghua 興化 Commandery, near Zheng Qiao’s home, and who had close connections with Zheng.⁹² Lin became known for spreading the Neo-Confucian teachings along the coastal region of Fujian. Lin’s high esteem for Zheng, whom he addressed as his “sixth older brother”, is well attested in a letter to him:

My sixth older brother, separated from Our Saint [= Confucius] by more than thousand years, has attained to the Way, which had not been transmitted any more. Confucius had wandered throughout half of the empire for thirty or forty years, before he returned from Wei to Lu. Then he set right the music and arranged the *Ya* and *Song* Odes in proper order [*Lunyu* IX.14]. At the end of all discussions, however, there was no one left who could understand the leading intention of this arrangement. But listening to your lectures in recent years, my mind was opened and my eyes were brightened.⁹³

⁸⁸ See *Zhuzi yulei* 80/2068, 2076, and 2079.

⁸⁹ See *SK* 160/1375a–b.

⁹⁰ There are three reasons for this: Firstly, Zhou Fu was a poet-friend of Xin Qiji 辛棄疾 (1140–1207) and had no scholarly ambitions. Secondly, in the *Fei Shi bian wang* Zheng Qiao is called by his personal name and not by his style or his literary name. Thirdly, the attribution to Zhou Fu entirely rests upon the inclusion of the treatise in Zhou’s collected writings, entitled *Duzhai ruidao bian* 蠹齋銳刀編 and edited in 1179. This edition originally contained 30 j. (see the foreword by Chen Gong 陳珙), but with the *Fei Shi bian wang* in 2 j. it amounts to 32 j. Referring to the postscript written by Xie Baiyue 解百禴 (unknown) and also dated 1179, the authors of the *SK* believed that the treatise was already included in the first edition of the *Duzhai ruidao bian* because this postscript refers to it as containing 32 j. (see *SK* 160/1375a). However, this actually was not the case for in the appendix to the *Zhenjiang zhi*, which was compiled in 1223, the *Duzhai ruidao bian* is recorded with 30 j., see (*Jiading*) *Zhenjiang zhi* (嘉定) 鎮江志 (Ed. *Song Yuan difangzhi congshu* 宋元地方志叢書, Taipei, 1980, vol. 5), *Fulu*, p. 19b. From this it becomes evident that the *Fei Shi bian wang* must have been appended to the *Duzhai ruidao bian* at a later date.

⁹¹ For his biography see *SRSY*, p. 1382–3, and the “Appendix” to Lin’s collected writings, ed. by Zheng Yue 鄭岳 (*jinshi* 1598), in *Aixuan ji* 艾軒集 (ed. *SKZB* 1/296), j. 10. See also *Song shi* 433/12862–3; *Song Yuan xue’an* 47/831–2.

⁹² See Yang Yufeng 楊玉峯, “Aixuan Yuzhong jiaoyi shulue” 艾軒漁仲交誼述略, *Dalu zazhi* 大陸雜誌 81:6 (1990), pp. 23–27.

⁹³ *Yu Zheng bianxiu Yuzhong*, in *Aixuan ji* 6/17a–b.

According to a note from the 13th century nobody except Zheng Qiao and Lin Guangzhao had fully realized that the “Prefaces” could not claim the authority either of Zixia or of Maogong 毛公.⁹⁴ However, looking at Lin’s random discussions of the *Shijing* in his miscellaneous writings, one hardly finds any critical remark on the “Prefaces”.⁹⁵ Moreover, there is evidence that Lin did not closely follow Zheng Qiao’s new approach. Apparently he was equally influenced by the *Shijing* exegesis in the school of the Su brothers which flourished at the beginning of the Southern Song dynasty, notably promoted by the above-mentioned Li Shu.⁹⁶

There is, however, a “recorded conversation” by Zhu Xi, written down as late as 1192, that Lin had subscribed to Zheng Qiao’s view that certain *Guofeng* Odes were “depraved”.⁹⁷ According to Zhu Xi’s words, Zheng had by and large grasped the fact that the *Shijing* contained “depraved songs”, adding that Lin had also expressed this view. We may assume that Zhu Xi made this remark in remembrance of his meeting with Lin early in life.⁹⁸ This meeting must have taken place between 1153 and 1156, when Zhu Xi had been appointed assistant magistrate in Tong’an/Quanzhou 同安/泉州, giving him an opportunity to pass through Putian on his way to and from his home, which was in Chong’an/Jianning 崇安/建寧 at that time.⁹⁹ It is said that Zhu Xi, then only about 25 years old, was deeply impressed by the discussions with Lin and a certain Fang Zhu 方翥 (*jinshi* 1138), allegedly even forgetting to eat and to sleep for several days.¹⁰⁰

The other, even more important person who helped make Zhu

⁹⁴ This note was written by Lin Xiyi 林希逸 (*jinshi* 1235), who had received the teachings of Lin Guangzhao, see *Song Yuan xue’an* 47/832.

⁹⁵ However, Lin agreed with Zheng Qiao in considering Ode No. 24, *He bi nong yi*, to be a song of critique. See the passage cited under Lin’s name in *Shantang kaosuo*, *Xuji* 7/9b–10. He also regarded the *Zhounan* and *Shaonan* Odes as popular songs from the South, sharply criticizing Ouyang Xiu’s interpretations of various Odes from these two sections. See *Yu Zhao zhuzuo Zizhi*, in *Aixuan ji* 6/14a–b.

⁹⁶ It is significant that Lin did not follow Zheng Qiao’s leading idea of the *Shijing* as having been arranged by Confucius according to the melodies of the Odes. Instead he proposed the thesis that the canon had already been fixed at an earlier date and that Confucius had only removed those lyrics which were debauched and repetitious. See *Aixuan ji* 3/8a.

⁹⁷ See *Zhu zi yulei* 23/539, h. 16.

⁹⁸ Regarding this first visit of Zhu Xi to Putian, see the note in the “Appendix” to Lin’s collected writings, in *Aixuan ji* 10/3a.

⁹⁹ Zhu Xi came to Putian two more times, namely in 1183 and 1187, see Gao Lingyin 高令印, *Zhu Xi shiji kao* 朱熹事迹考, Shanghai: Shanghai renmin, 1987, pp. 72–73. But by this time all the scholars he had previously met were already dead, see the note cited in n. 98.

¹⁰⁰ See the note cited in n. 98. For Fang Zhu, a friend of Lin Guangzhao and

Xi familiar with Zheng Qiao's teachings on the *Shijing* was Chen Zhirou (?—1184, *jinshi* 1042), who came from Yongchun 永春 in Quanzhou, the prefecture next to Xinghua.¹⁰¹ In his funeral eulogy, dated to the 27th day of the third month, 1184, Zhu Xi recalled his first meeting with Chen almost 30 years earlier, i.e. when he was in office in Tong'an. Thereafter he had seen him again just two months before his death. According to Zhu's account, this was a very pleasant meeting. For some days they had engaged in discussions and wandered about in the Mountains of the Nine Suns (Jiurishan 九日山, ca. 50 km from Quanzhou). The account ends by mentioning their mutual exchange on scholarly matters.¹⁰² Furthermore, Chen Zhirou was also in communication with Lin Guangzhao, notably discussing the "Odes", as may be seen from a letter of Lin's to Chen.¹⁰³

Unfortunately, we do not know much about Chen's *Shijing* studies. He appears to have been the main proponent of Zheng Qiao's teachings on the *Shijing*. Following Zheng, Chen rebuked the "Prefaces" of the "Odes", frankly calling its author a "fool" (*wangren* 妄人).¹⁰⁴ In addition, he called for an interpretation of the "Odes" that would refer to their musical setting. Thus, he is cited saying that "The *Odes* had originally been made for music. Therefore scholars of today have to grasp them according to their melodies. Then they will perceive that the *Odes* were made with refinement (*bugou* 不苟)".¹⁰⁵

Zheng Qiao, see *Song Yuan xue'an* 29/608. There is a note by Lin from which it appears that Zheng was considered as the *spiritus rector* among the friends, see *Yu Yang Cishan*, in *Aixuan ji* 6/23b. According to a local legend, Zhu Xi paid also a visit to Zheng Qiao during his early stay in Putian, leaving behind his horse at a large stone (*xiamashi* 下馬石) half-way up the hill to Zheng Qiao's house (*Jiaji caotang* 夾漈草堂). However, there is no supporting evidence of this legend.

¹⁰¹ For Chen's biography see SRSY, p. 2593, and *Daonan yuanwei* 道南源委 (ed. CSJS 3344–3345) 2/48.

¹⁰² See *Ji Chen Xiuzhai wen*, in *Zhu Wengong wenji* 87/15a–b.

¹⁰³ See *Yu Chen Xunzhou Tiren*, in *Aixuan ji* 6/19a.

¹⁰⁴ See *Shantang kaosuo*, *Xuji* 7/32b, h. 6 and *Bieji* 7/12b, h. 2. According to a "recorded conversation", Zhu Xi said of Zheng Qiao that he had similarly called the author of the "Prefaces" "a fool from the countryside" (*cunye wangren* 村野妄人), see *Zhu zi yulei* 80/2076, h. 2. See also in *Shi bian wang* no. 44 (Gu Jiegang [comp.], p. 44). This word became later the label of Zheng Qiao's critique of the "Prefaces", but it seems rather unlikely that Zheng had used it because his argumentation concerning the "Prefaces" was too sophisticated for such a word. Take, for instance, his discussion of the "Prefaces" to the *Song Odes*, which he considered to be authentic. See *Tongzhi*, *Yue lue* I, 49/633c–634a, and *Shi bian wang* no. 49 (Gu Jiegang [comp.], p. 46).

¹⁰⁵ See the quote in Zhu Xi's letter to Chen Zhirou, cf. *Da Chen Tiren*, in *Zhu Wengong wenji* 37/42b, h. 8–9.

Chen Zhirou's emphasis on the musical aspect of the "Odes" can also be seen from the fact that he was the author of a "Music Book of Melodies to the *Odes*" (*Shi sheng pu* 詩聲譜) in two *juan*. However, we lack any further information about this work.¹⁰⁶ Fortunately, Chen is cited once in the compilation entitled "Profound Discussions on the Six Classics" (*Liujing aolun* 六經奧論),¹⁰⁷ which is connected with Zheng Qiao (see n. 61). This quotation makes it possible to identify him as the author of at least five other texts cited in encyclopaedic and exegetical works of the late Song and Yuan periods.¹⁰⁸ In the longest of these texts, with more than 1,250 characters, Chen attacks the traditional notions of *Zhounan* / *Shaonan*, *Guofeng*, *Minor Ya* / *Major Ya*, and *Song*, and thereby clearly draws upon Zheng Qiao's redefinitions of these terms.¹⁰⁹

However, Chen even went beyond Zheng in two respects: Firstly, he developed the idea that the three parts of the "Odes", i.e. *Feng*, *Ya*, and *Song*, were distinguished by their different "literary styles" (*ti* 體, *tizhi* 體質, *ticai* 體裁).¹¹⁰ Secondly, he was the first to advance

¹⁰⁶ See *Jingyi kao* 經義考 (ed. *Sibu beiyao* 四部備要) 106/7b.

¹⁰⁷ See *Liujing aolun* 3/12b–13a.

¹⁰⁸ One is in *Shantang kaosuo*, *Xuji* 7/30b–33b; the discussion of the *Song* Odes in this text, which is cited under the name of "Mr Chen" (*Chenshi* 陳氏), is close in content to the quote in *Liujing aolun* 3/12b–13a; the same text is also cited in *Shantang kaosuo*, *Bieji* 7/10a–13b, which is longer by two sections at the beginning and the end of the citation. Three are in *Shantang kaosuo*, *Xuji* 7/1b–2a, 7/3b–4a, and 7/34a–b (again cited under "Mr Chen"). The fifth is in *Shi zhuan tongshi* 詩傳通釋 (ed. *SKZB* III/41–44) 1/4a (cited under "Mr Chen of the [*Shantang*] *Kaosuo*"). Recently, Hoyt C. Tillman (see n. 58 above), referring in particular to the *Shantang kaosuo*, has pointed out the significance of encyclopaedic compilations for Song intellectual history.

¹⁰⁹ See the first text cited in n. 108. Interestingly, Chen Zhirou attacks the traditional definition of "*Song*" being Odes which "announce to spiritual beings the grand achievements of the embodied forms of complete virtue" (*Great Preface*, pericope no. 17; translation according to Legge IV, p. XXXVI). Pin-pointing the notion of "announcing to spiritual beings", Chen argues that *Song* just were Odes in praise of the prince. He goes on saying that though there had been a long tradition of such compositions, songs in the style of *Song* Odes were again related to evil religious practices involving spiritual beings, ghosts, and human sacrifices in his own times. See *Liujing aolun* 3/12b. On the practice of human sacrifices, which became again remarkably widespread during the first century of the Southern Song dynasty, see Tai Jingnong 臺靜農, "Nan Song renti xisheng ji" 南宋人體犧牲祭 in *id.*, *Tai Jingnong lunwen ji* 臺靜農論文集, Taipei: Linking, 1989, pp. 325–338.

¹¹⁰ According to Ye Shi 葉適 (1150–1223), Zheng Qiao had also characterized the different literary styles of the four parts of the "Odes". See the citation in (*Conggui*) *Mao Shi jijie* (ed. *SKQS*, vol. 74) 1/23a–b. Though it is doubtful that this idea had originated with Zheng Qiao himself, Ye's remark is a hint at its association with Zheng Qiao's followers.

the thesis that the notion *Nan* 南 (South) in the two terms *Zhounan* and *Shaonan* did not refer to the geographical origin of these folk-songs in the Huai-Yangzi region, but denoted their type of music.¹¹¹ This thesis, which was taken up later by Cheng Dachang 程大昌 (1123–1195),¹¹² is fully elaborated in the *Shi zong wen*.¹¹³ This underlines the above made assertion that the *Shi zong wen* had strongly been influenced by the *Shijing* scholarship flourishing in the Putian-Quanzhou region.

Chen Zhirou's main idea of the different literary styles of the Odes had earlier been put forward by Lin Guangzhao, who perceived *Feng*, *Ya*, and *Song* as literary genres prevalent in Zhou times, which moulded the literary forms of later ages.¹¹⁴ Consonant with this view, Lin pointed out that the *Guofeng* were not true folksongs but songs written down by literati who had entered into the feelings of the common people.¹¹⁵ In the same context, we have to consider Chen Zhirou's notion of "refinement" as revealed in the "Odes" (see above).

Viewing the "Odes" as patterns for the development of literary forms implied a significant difference in Lin's and Chen's exegetical approach compared with Zheng Qiao's.¹¹⁶ While the latter had proposed to limit *Shijing* exegesis to the explanations of the botanical and zoological aspects of the "Odes",¹¹⁷ Lin Guangzhao

¹¹¹ See the last text cited in n. 108 above.

¹¹² See *Shi lun* 詩論 (ed. CSJC 1711) I–III, pp. 1–3.

¹¹³ See *Shi zong wen*, *Wen Nan* I–III, 1/1–3.

¹¹⁴ This view is developed at length in *Aixuan ji* 3/8a–10b.

¹¹⁵ See *Yu Huang shaoqing Zhongzhen*, in *Aixuan ji* 6/10a.

¹¹⁶ The difference becomes obvious, for instance, with regard to the *Binfeng* Odes. Unlike Zheng Qiao, who regarded these Odes as songs set to the popular airs from the Guanzhong region (see n. 69 above), Lin argued that they encompassed the *Feng* and the *Ya* styles and therefore were rightly placed at the end of the *Guofeng* Odes and next to the *Ya* Odes. See the passage cited under Lin's name in *Shantang kaosuo*, *Xuji* 7/17a. This view was also put forward by Chen Zhirou (see *Shantang kaosuo*, *Bieji* 7/13b) and in the introductory remark to the *Guofeng* in *Shi zong wen* 2/23.

¹¹⁷ Providing a theoretical foundation of this exegetical approach, Zheng Qiao pointed to Confucius' saying "From the *Odes* we become largely acquainted with the names of birds, beasts, and plants" (*Lunyu* XVII.9). See *Tongzhi*, *Kunchong caomu lue* 1, 75/865b, h. 7ff. See also *Shi bian wang* no. 14 (Gu Jiegang [comp.], p. 26). According to two prefaces to Zheng Qiao's *Shijing* commentary, which were written by Yu Ji 虞集 (1272–1348) and Zhu Derun 朱德潤 (1294–1365), a punctilious exegesis of the fauna and flora occurring in the "Odes" was indeed its characteristic feature. See *Zhengshi Mao Shi xu* 鄭氏毛詩序, in *Daoyuan xuegu lu* 道園學古錄 (ed. SBCK A/76) 31/277b–278a, and *Zheng Jiaji Shi zhuan xu* 鄭夾際詩傳序, in *Cunfuzhai ji* 存復齋集 (ed. ZGXSMZ 366) 4/1a–2a.

and Chen Zhirou obviously intended to treat the *Shijing* primarily as literary remains. Common to both attitudes, however, was their challenge of the traditional understanding of the “Odes”, which focused on their ethical function.

Zhu Xi's restoration of the moralistic understanding of the “Odes”

While working at the middle version of his *Shijing* commentary (between 1177 and 1181/82), Zhu Xi became keenly conscious of this challenge. As pointed out above, he opposed Lü Zuqian's notion of *Zheng* and *Ya*, basing his views on the redefinitions of *Feng*, *Ya*, and *Song* proposed by Zheng Qiao and other Fukienese scholars. The influence on Zhu Xi of Zheng Qiao's new approach to the “Odes” at that time is apparent, for instance, in the fact that he adopted Zheng's explanation of the *jujiu* as a mallard duck in the middle version of his commentary.¹¹⁸ On the other hand, he sensed the danger of the emphasis on the musical aspect, which would eventually lead to question the *Shijing* as a canonical text. Thus, in a letter written to Chen Zhirou, he defended the precedence of the texts over the melodies, defining them as the “root” (*ben* 本) of *Shijing* exegesis, whereas the melodies only constituted the “branches” (*mo* 末). Their loss was regrettable, but not of vital importance.¹¹⁹ This repudiation of the call for the precedence of the musical aspect was later highly praised by Wang Bo, who even compared Zhu Xi in this respect with the Duke of Zhou who had allegedly established the proper usage of the Odes.¹²⁰

With this use of the terms “root” and “branches” in the context of *Shijing* hermeneutics, Zhu Xi had resorted to Ouyang Xiu's famous “Treatise on the ‘root’ and the ‘branches’ (of *Shijing* exegesis)” (*Benmo lun* 本末論).¹²¹ With this treatise, Ouyang had laid the

¹¹⁸ See the discussion by a certain Jiang cited in (*Conggui*) *Mao Shi jijie* 1/34a, h. 2aff. See also William A. Roulston, “After 3,000 Years—A Scene from an Ancient Classic Comes to Life”, in George Kao (ed.), *Chinese History and Historiography*, Hong Kong, 1982, pp. 151–154. Roulston takes no notice of the fact that Zheng Qiao was the first to explain the *jujiu* as a mallard duck. Though Zhu Xi adopted Zheng's explanation, he nevertheless stuck to the traditional exegesis interpreting the alternating cries of two *jujiu* on the islet in the river as signaling mutual sympathy and respect between man and woman, see *Shi jizhuan* 1/3a.

¹¹⁹ See *Da Chen Tiren*, in *Zhu Wengong wenji* 37/42b–43b.

¹²⁰ See Wang Bo in his *Shi yi* 2/18.

¹²¹ In *Shi benyi* 14/6a–9a. Zhu Xi spoke highly of this treatise, which he included in an appendix to the early version of his commentary, see *Da Fan Bochong* #2, in *Zhu Wengong wenji* 39/34b, h. 1. For a translation of this text see my forthcoming book cited in n. 60 above.

foundation of the Neo-Confucian *Shijing* exegesis with its focus on the “discursive exposition” (*yili*) of the ethical purport of each Ode. Zhu Xi approved of Ouyang’s validation of the normative character of the “Odes”, basing his main argument against Chen Zhirou upon the well-known and often cited phrase “Odes articulate the (moral) aim” (*shi yan zhi* 詩言志).¹²² According to Zhu Xi, this phrase offered the proof that the “(moral) aim” (*zhi* 志) preceded the composition of a lyric (*shi* 詩) and the lyric preceded its musical setting. Thus, one could get over the loss of the ancient music. Because it had been irrevocably lost, emphasizing the musical aspect as crucial for the exegesis of the “Odes” was rather like drawing a cake when one is hungry. Even if the music had been handed down from antiquity, the approach to the “Odes” through the music would only constitute the lower level of understanding, and would be no substitute for reading the texts in order to arrive at the “moral aim” as the very root of the “Odes”.

In accordance with this argumentation in his letter to Chen Zhirou, Zhu Xi throughout his teachings recommended grasping the “general meaning” (*da yi* 大意) of each Ode instead of paying too much attention to its historical background, not to mention of botanical or zoological details.¹²³ Thus, he ended up in virtually contradicting the new exegesis promoted by Zheng Qiao. Defending the normative character of the “Odes” on the one hand, but denying the “Prefaces” on the other hand, Zhu Xi’s *Shijing* study may be seen as an attempt to bridge the gap between the two opposing exegetical approaches to the “Odes”, represented by Wang Anshi and Zheng Qiao respectively. This attempt resulted in the theory of the “depraved songs” based upon the central idea that even from Odes looked upon as “depraved” moralistic lessons could be derived (see above, n. 3). Too sophisticated to be understood by his undistinguished followers, the attempted reconciliation was bound to fail from its very beginning.

It is noteworthy that there were numerous musical settings to *Shijing* poems which were composed from the 13th to the 19th century and were similar in style to the twelve melodies included in the *Yili jingzhuan tongjie*.¹²⁴ This tendency culminated in the *Qinding*

¹²² *Shangshu*, *Shun dian*, 3/131c; Legge III, p. 48. On the early understanding of this phrase and its impact on the development of the moralistic *Shijing* exegesis adopted by Han scholars, see the profound study by Zhu Ziqing 朱自清, “*Shi yan zhi bian*” 詩言志辨, *Zhu Ziqing gudian wenxue lunwenji* 朱自清古典文學論文集, 2 vols., Taipei: Hongye, 1983, vol. 1, pp. 183–355, here pp. 193ff.

¹²³ See, for instance, *Shi zhuan yishuo* (cf. n. 23 above) 2/21b.

¹²⁴ See Liu Deyi, *Zhongguo yinyue wenhua zhi huigu* (cf. n. 23 above), pp. 39ff.

Shijing yuepu quanshu (欽定詩經樂譜全書), a work imperially commissioned and completed in 1789. It contains notations for all 311 Odes. Of course, these were all new compositions. Yet, the hope of recovering the ancient music was never abandoned. We have a note by the ingenious Zhu Zaiyu 朱載堉 (1536–1611) saying that the absence of melodies to the “Odes” had been badly felt by the chancellor of the University Lü Nan 呂柟 (1479–1542). With over one hundred friends he had searched for *Shijing* melodies throughout all the empire, bringing together more than 80. However, after his removal from office his music book with all the melodies was also lost.¹²⁵ As Zhu Xi had said with a sigh, we will hear again the music of the *Zhounan* and *Shaonan* Odes as well as the legendary *Shao* 韶 music only when we attain the mysterious virtue of Shun 舜, who had governed the whole kingdom well by playing the zither and singing the “Air of the South” (*Nanfeng* 南風).¹²⁶

¹²⁵ Cited in *Xu Wenxian tongkao* 續文獻通考 (ed. Shanghai: Shangwu, 1936) 105/3727a. According to Liu Deyi, p. 43, Lü Nan’s music book was printed under the title of *Shi yue tupu* 詩樂圖譜 in 19 j. in 1536. The first page of this edition is reproduced on p. 55, but Liu does not give any bibliographical information about it.

¹²⁶ See *Da Chen Tiren*, in *Zhu Wengong wenji* 37/43b, h. 4–5. With his mention of Shun’s playing the zither and singing the *Nanfeng*, which obviously is regarded as the model of the music to the *Zhounan* and *Shaonan* Odes, Zhu Xi refers to *Li ji* 禮記 (ed. SSJZS) XIX (*Yue ji*), 38/1534a, *Shi ji* 史記 (ed. Zhonghua) 24/1197, and *Kongzi jiaoyu* 孔子家語 (ed. Shanghai: Shangwu, 1940 [*Guoxue jiben congshu*]) XXXV (*Bian yue jie*), 8/205. On the *Shao* music and its references in the early works, see Gu Yisheng 顧易生, “Kongzi lun Shao kao” 孔子論〈韶〉考, *Xueshu yuekan* 學術月刊 1987: 4, pp. 49–50.